

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/023,556	02/13/1998	MOUTAZ KOTOB		7109
7:	590 04/03/2002			
ROCKEY MILNAMOW & KATZ TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA SUITE 4700			EXAMINER FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA	
	2876			
			DATE MAILED: 04/03/2002	?

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/023,556	KOTOB ET AL.					
navisory nation	Examin r	Art Unit					
	Jamara A. Franklin	2876					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 18 March 2002 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the same of this application in the same of the same	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	•						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moteraned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the content of the co	pelow);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the					
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to: none.							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	/					
10. Other: See Continuation Sheet		Lallh					
		KARL D. FRECH PRIMARY EXAMINER					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner contends that the Wise, Webb, Davis, III, Lohry, Katayama and Graft, III references read upon the claimed limitations.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claims 1-24 remain rejected as set forth in the final rejection of paper no. 13.